HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XV, No. 40 Monday, October 6, 1958 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

NIXON: *Can he assume Taft's mantle?*.....(page 1)

CHINA: *Appeasement by mail*.....(page 1)

ROCKEFELLER: *Half-term Governor?*.....(page 2)

COURT: *Frankfurter and the NAACP*.....(page 2)

LOUISIANA: *Grass-roots revolt*.....(page 3)

The New Nixon: The outstanding political development of the past week: Vice President Nixon has assumed the leadership of the Republican party. No competent observer in Washington challenges this fact, although many, because of discretion or other reasons, hesitate to affirm it publicly.

Political scientists point out that the "new Nixon" role has long been inevitable because it fills the vacuum left by the sharp fall in Ike's power and prestige. No one on Capitol Hill was surprised in the past few days to read public-opinion pollster Samuel Lubell's frank report (in the Scripps-Howard chain) that the people at the grass roots talk about this sad situation constantly. "Things are in an uproar, but what is Ike doing? All you read about is that he's playing golf." So ran the refrain in Lubell's country-wide opinion sampling.

Hence, Nixon has burnt his bridges with the "moderates" and political neutralists and is on a junket of jousting, to rebuild the Republican party from the ruins left after the resignation of Sherman Adams, the Modern Republican hatchet man. An inspiring profile of a young, combative leader replaces that of a relaxed, golf-playing President.

Nor are Nixon's oratorical themes merely "party harmony appeals." His first speech on his tour, in Indiana, roused the editorial enthusiasm of the Chicago *Tribune*, significant of conservative Midwest opinion. Nixon launched attacks on the labor bosses, on the Democratic congressional spenders and on unsound fiscal thinking. This is Republicanism on the offensive with the best chance of affecting coming election results.

The Vice President predicted "a wild spending binge by radical Democrats," if the latter won. He said: "When you vote for more Democrats in the House and Senate you are voting to raise your taxes, cheapen your money, and to stifle the new investment and enterprise which means more jobs and progress." As the Chicago Tribune *commented: "The best chance of winning wavering voters back to the party is to impress them with what to expect if overwhelming Democratic majorities" result in Congress. This constitutes the reverse of "me-tooism."*

● The Vice President in his "new" role has the satisfaction of noting that the enemy cries "ouch." The AFL-CIO, after some timorous hesitation, hit back at his sound-economy and lower-taxes-for-industry speech at Harvard. And the "liberal" press tried to put Nixon on the spot when he attacked the appeasers seeking to weaken our policy of defending Quemoy and Formosa (see story below).

Shrewd watchers of the political scene have no illusions that Nixon in his new role is fighting solely the Democratic party. It becomes evident that he is also fighting to keep his leadership of the Republicans, to maintain his political future and to checkmate any political rivals in the GOP who might challenge his well staked-out claim for the nomination in 1960.

HUMAN EVENTS learns from a reliable source in the high command of the New York GOP that the advisers of Nelson Rockefeller, GOP gubernatorial candidate in the Empire State, have rejected all suggestions that Nixon be invited to include New York in his speech-making tour of the country.

Nixon, it is believed here, well knows this fact and it presumably has put him further on guard against the Rockefeller bid for power. It is obvious that, if Rockefeller should win the Governorship in November, he would control the New York GOP delegation to the national convention and this delegation would play a decisive role in picking the 1960 GOP nominee for the Presidency. It is recalled that Governor Dewey, wielding the same power, dictated the choice of Ike against Taft in 1952; and it is noted that Dewey is behind the Rockefeller Governorship bid this year. Old-timers here speculate that, with Nixon appealing to the old Taft followers now, things may be shaping up to a repetition of the Taft-Ike battle in 1952.

● Thus, Nixon has to fight on two fronts. Evidence seems to point to the "new Nixon" veering to the right, to the followers of Taft. The Senator from Ohio is dead, but one elder statesman of the right wing is very much alive—General Douglas MacArthur. On March 10, 1958, HUMAN EVENTS reported that Nixon, on his own initiative, had a long talk with the General in the Waldorf. And the conservative, patriotic ideas which MacArthur offered to the young Vice President on that occasion bear a startling identity with the course and utterances of the "new Nixon."

State Department: Nixon scored sharply when he attacked an unnamed bureaucrat in the State Department for releasing unevaluated figures on mail to the Department *in re* the Formosa-Quemoy controversy. Around the town, it is widely rumored that Communist and "liberal" outfits have been flooding the State Department with a considerable volume of mail, calling for appeasement of the Chinese Reds.

It is known that the Communists have boasted of

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their ability to get 50,000 letters to the Government, on any subject, within a matter of 72 hours. For this reason, wise heads in Washington look for signs of spontaneity in the mail, discount mimeographed sheets, form letters, duplicates, and letters bearing a marked similarity of structure or wording. The Capital is interested in individual letters that reflect deep and representative feelings of the people at large—not the sentiments of disciplined pressure groups.

(Some indicators that the current influx is not spontaneous: the Northern California "Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy" is running newspaper ads saying "No War For Quemoy," and containing a "clip-and-mail" form letter that urges a sellout to the Chinese Communists. United Press on September 27 took note of the incidence of mimeographed letters in the State Department's mail, revealing the existence of an organized campaign.)

Why the "unevaluated" release of mail statistics was made to the press has not been made clear. At any rate, its purport (opposed to the "defend Quemoy" policy) is directly the reverse of the White House mail, which is running two-to-one in favor of a stand against the Reds.

As for Dulles being "undercut" by a subordinate, veterans on the Hill remark that the Secretary has only himself to blame. Nixon's reference to "sabotage" by a State Department underling recalls the fact that friends of Dulles, since 1953, have repeatedly urged him to clean out the old Acheson-Truman stalwarts in the Department bureaucracy. But the Secretary has so far apparently failed to understand the problem and its solution. Capitol Hill speculates that the matter may take another turn—that Senator Eastland, head of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, may turn that group's spotlight on the State Department in a manner reminiscent of the efforts of the late Senator McCarthy.

Thunder on the Hudson: According to political observers in New York state, voters are privately asking a very pointed question which may soon be aired in the press and on the hustings. It is directed at the comparatively young Nelson Rockefeller, who is running for a four-year term in the State House in Albany.

The question: will Rockefeller, if elected, fill out his full four-year term until 1962? If Rockefeller pledges "yes," that would remove many complications from the GOP internal picture. If Rockefeller says "no," or dodges the question, the implication will be that he simply wants the New York Governorship as a steppingstone to the White House.

The same question, it is recalled, was fired at William F. Knowland at the start of his bid for the California Governorship. Knowland, characteristically, gave a flat and unequivocal "yes," pledging himself to serve out his four-year term if elected. Many New York voters await a similarly frank affirmation from Rockefeller.

● Meanwhile, speculation grows apace that conservative New Yorkers may split their ballots between Democrat Harriman and Representative Kenneth Keating, GOP Senatorial candidate. Respect for Keating was augmented greatly by his declaration last week that the US must not "knuckle under" to Red China. Keating lashed out at those proposing trade with Peiping, as well as at advocates of recognition.

Labor Political Power: Reports from Maine about the magnitude of the labor bosses' political activities on behalf of Democratic candidates there cast a pall over incautiously enthusiastic Republican workers. In the Pine Tree State, the press is running one report that the bosses spent about $250,000 in the recent campaign, which so badly routed the Republicans. But even the lowest estimates are ominous, if the labor bosses continue to throw such strength into other elections coming up this fall.

According to the Bangor *Daily News,* labor opened up shop in Maine on April 24, when Mrs. Esther Murray, a top organizer from COPE (labor's political action group) headquarters in Washington, arrived in Maine. Other boss-propelled organizers followed. Labor's strategy called for at least two organizers in every labor precinct, several TV shows, hundreds of TV and radio spots, widespread distribution of literature, phone campaigns and car pools on election day. COPE organized absentee ballot operations, set up car pools in all industrial areas, rented sound trucks, bought two special TV shows on the Sunday before election.

Washington's reaction to this picture: Business will have to hurry up and organize the same type of political action if it wants the labor bosses to go down in defeat in November.

High Court: The Supreme Court's unprecedented Little Rock decision last week—ruling on a case that had not yet come before it—has set legal minds buzzing in the Capital, and has further stoked the fires of resentment against the Court. In declaring illegal the transfer of Little Rock high schools to a private corporation, the justices decided a case which was still being heard by a lower tribunal, and which had not been argued at all before the High Court. The upshot of this unheard-of procedure is to fix the Court more than ever as an object of angry attention and inquiry.

In particular, Capital eyes are now focussed on Associate Justice Felix Frankfurter, oldest sitting member of the Court. It has long been a current comment in Washington that Frankfurter is the ruling power in the Court, and that he influences Chief Justice Earl Warren. (See "The Web of Warren," by Frank C. Hanighen, in HUMAN EVENTS for January 6, 1958.) In the current decision, many profess to read the complete ascendancy of Frankfurter—a persistent advocate of total Federal supremacy—over Court and country alike.

This apprehension takes on all the more significance in view of the disclosure, made last week by the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, *that Frankfurter was at one time formally connected with the NAACP—chief plaintiff in the school segregation cases. In admitting the connection charged by the* Standard-Times, *Frankfurter alleged that he had never received financial remuneration for his services—a fact supposedly eliminating any "conflict of interest" on his part.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But financial remuneration, it is noted, has never been one of Frankfurter's chief incentives. Rather, he has preferred to take his reward in terms of power—in seeing his protégés placed in various strategic spots throughout the Government and in influential organizations. Thus Frankfurter's commitment to the NAACP cause cannot be judged by the absence of financial rewards. He would have been more than content simply to see the NAACP following a course prescribed by himself, to assuage what John T. Flynn has called his "yearning to exercise power from the sidelines"—"to shape affairs anonymously."

Inside the White House: Recent Presidential appointments, according to inside observers, reflect a head-on collision between conservatives and "liberals" within the Administration. Professor Malcolm Moos, the President's new speech-writer, is well-known in the Capital as an out-and-out New Dealer, considerably to the left of the banished "modern," Arthur Larson.

Rated a "toss up" is Henry C. Wallich, appointed to serve as assistant to Secretary of the Treasury Anderson. Wallich is a "new conservative" professor from Yale, viewed as a lukewarm Keynesian inclined toward *laissez faire* policies.

Expressing a more explicit conservative tendency are two other recent appointments, that of General Wilton Persons, to succeed Sherman Adams, and that of Don Paarlberg, formerly with the Department of Agriculture, to succeed economic adviser Gabriel Hauge. Both of these men, according to Washington information, should be improvements over their predecessors.

Persons was the favorite candidate of Capitol Hill to move into Adams' spot (see HUMAN EVENTS for July 21, 1958), and is known to have the approval of powerful Senate GOP leader Styles Bridges (N.H.). Paarlberg is liked by conservative elements who followed his career in the Agriculture Department. Those who have heard him speak say that, under Benson's aegis, he talked like an "aggressive conservative," firmly committed to an economy free of Government controls.

Cuba: Subject of frequent speculation in after-hours talk in the Capital is the relationship of *The New York Times* and some other influential newspapers to the Cuban insurrection led by Fidel Castro. Often noted is the extensive and benevolent coverage lavished on the rebel leader by the *Times,* and the ready access that its reporters and photographers seem to have to Castro's supposedly "secret" hideout.

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, management and circulation, required by the Act of Congress of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Acts of March 3, 1933 and July 2, 1946. Published weekly at Washington, D. C., for October 1, 1958. 1. The names and addresses of the editor, publisher, executive publisher and business manager are: Editor, Frank C. Hanighen, 4745 Reservoir Road, N.W., Washington, D. C.; Publisher, Frank C. Hanighen, 4745 Reservoir Road, N.W., Washington, D. C.; Executive Publisher James L. Wick, 135 D St., S.E., Washington, D. C.; Business Manager, Patricia G. Lutz, 5103 Saratoga Ave., Washington 16, D. C. 2. The owner is: OWNER—HUMAN EVENTS, INC., 408 First St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Stockholders owning or holding one per cent or more of the total amount of stock: Frank C. Hanighen, 4745 Reservoir Road, N.W., Washington, D. C.; James L. Wick, 135 D St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. 3. The known bondholders, mortgagees and other security holders owning or holding one per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: NONE. 4. Paragraphs 2 and 3 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting: also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner. 5. The average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the 12 months preceding the date shown above was: 38,119. PATRICIA G. LUTZ, Business Manager. Sworn to and subscribed before me this 2nd day of October, 1958. M. L. Semerjian, Notary Public, District of Columbia. Commission expires July 31, 1962.

Congressman Mendel Rivers (D.-S.C.), just prior to the end of the recent session, gave vent to his indignation at the *Times'* cordial behavior toward Castro—even after he had kidnapped American personnel.

"Has *The New York Times,*" Rivers asked, "ever disapproved of the kidnapping of United States servicemen and citizens? Does *The New York Times* forget that kidnapping in the United States is a Federal offense punishable by death? Is not the . . . editorial policy of *The New York Times* piling problems upon the United States Armed Forces responsible for the defense of the Caribbean? Is not *The New York Times* willingly or unwittingly conforming to the policy of Russia to create strife, diversions and distractions to United States military commanders, in this very important part of our hemispheric defense of the Caribbean and the Americas?"

How They Win in Dixie: "Add left-wingers on the run—Governor Earl Long of Louisiana." That's the reading given to the upset victory last week of conservative Democrat Harold McSween, in Louisiana's Eighth Congressional District, over a hand-picked Long candidate (see HUMAN EVENTS for September 22, 1958). McSween, who will now assume his seat in Washington unopposed, ran on a program backing states' rights, opposing foreign-aid giveaways, and demanding a reduction in taxes. (As in most districts in the South, a primary victory is equivalent to election. McSween will have no GOP opponent in November.)

In an attempt to promote his candidate, welfare-stater Long laid his own prestige on the line, took the stump against McSween. Result: McSween, who had been rated an underdog, trounced his opponent by 8,000 (out of 60,000) votes.

Commented Managing Editor Adras LaBorde of the Alexandria Town Talk (largest paper in the district): "There is hope that there is actually a majority of voters in this district who have come to realize that a return to conservatism, to constitutional government, is necessary if we are going to retain the characteristics that distinguish this great Nation from any other on earth . . . "

Far East: The rush of events confirms the judgment—reported in HUMAN EVENTS for September 8, 1958—that the fate of Formosa will ride upon what happens to Quemoy. If Quemoy is sold out, it is feared, Formosa's defenders will be so demoralized that the larger island could not long prevail.

This being so, many in the Capital wish that the Administration would make crystal clear to the people the crucial importance of holding Formosa as an outpost for the defense of America. They recommend to the attention of US policy-makers the masterful analysis of General Douglas MacArthur, which he prepared as a message to the 1950 Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. This address, suppressed at the last minute by the Truman Administration, states in no uncertain terms the vital significance of Formosa for American defense.

"As a result of its geographic location and base potential," MacArthur said, "utilization of Formosa by a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

military power hostile to the United States may either counterbalance or overshadow the strategic importance of the central and southern flank of the United States front-line position. Formosa in the hands of such a hostile power could be compared to an unsinkable aircraft carrier and submarine tender ideally located to accomplish offensive strategy and at the same time checkmate defensive or counteroffensive operations by friendly forces based on Okinawa and the Philippines."

MacArthur added: "Nothing could be more fallacious than the threadbare argument by those who advocate appeasement and defeatism in the Pacific that if we defend Formosa we alienate continental Asia. Those who speak thus do not understand the Orient. They do not grasp that it is the pattern of Oriental psychology to respect and follow aggressive, resolute and dynamic leadership—to quickly turn from a leadership characterized by timidity or vacillation—and they underestimate the Oriental mentality."

● The Quemoy encounter, say students of the Far East, has exposed Red China as a "paper tiger," torn by internal fears of insurrection, unable to depend upon its enslaved people. As syndicated columnist Joseph Alsop observed last week:

" . . . there are many reasons, convincing to anyone not absolutely stultified by the odd mystique of Chinese communism, for suspecting the existence of a moral-political crisis inside China. This would be automatically reflected in the armed forces. There are signs to confirm this suspicion, too. Quite possibly, for instance, the Communist pilots are ill-trained because they are not trusted with enough fuel for long flights."

Vade Mecum for GOP: Politicos in Washington urge political workers in the field to study organized labor's procedures for getting out the vote. In some states the bosses get the board of elections to put registration booths at factory gates. They conduct contests between union locals to register 100 per cent of their votes.

Conservatives, it is remarked, have developed no similar methods of pressuring people to go to the polls. They usually rely upon the enthusiasm of volunteer workers—an approach that cannot always be counted upon.

In 1956, one "professional" technique developed by conservatives bore fruit in the renomination campaign of Representative Ralph Gwinn. It was worked out by Harold J. Kiley (address: 4619 Richardson Avenue, New York, N.Y.), who set up a battery of telephones in a key spot in Gwinn's district and put a force of women to work on them. (If possible, he says, in making such arrangements, organizers should pay the workers, even if the amount of pay is small. Volunteers, no matter how enthusiastic, have a habit of going out for a coffee-break and not coming back.) Supervision is vital to prevent the group from gossiping rather than telephoning.

The most important instruction to the canvasser is never, never, never *to argue with the voters at the other end of the phone. No converts are made over the telephone—certainly not by inexperienced "election sales people." The moment a voter indicates disagreement the phone worker must terminate the conversation: "That is your privilege Mrs. Brown, thank you, goodbye." Time is of the essence. The important mission is to reach the maximum number of people with a courteous but firm appeal.*

Kiley says the phone conversations ran, in substance, as follows: "Mrs. Brown? I am calling you about Congressman Gwinn. The Gwinn for Congress Committee urges you to vote next Tuesday for Congressman Gwinn. Ralph Gwinn votes right and he is one of the ablest men in Congress . . . Please vote for him and get your friends to vote for him. This district needs Ralph Gwinn in Congress."

If the voter said he had other things to do than to vote on Tuesday, the telephoner replied: "Congressman Gwinn will lose if you and your friends do not vote next Tuesday. He needs your support and he needs the support of every good American."

If the voter asked how Gwinn voted on a certain issue, the answer was: "I'll make a note to send you a leaflet, about Mr. Gwinn's record." Callers closed with: "Thank you, Mrs. Brown. We hope you'll vote for our great Congressman."

Education: A report released last week by the National Education Association—the result of a nationwide conference on talented students—gives new and clear-cut evidence that the educationists plan to press at every opportunity for stronger programs of "guidance and counseling" in the public schools. Confirming forecasts contained in past issues of HUMAN EVENTS, the conference recommended "a rigorous counseling program, with guidance based on aptitude and/or intelligence tests and school records."

The opening vista of "rigorous" counseling is an unpleasant one to conservatives, who fear (on the basis of substantial evidence) that current guidance programs, while advertised as "aptitude" or "intelligence" tests, are actually designed to condition school children towards collectivism and "togetherness." (See "Guided Minds: The Promise and the Threat," by Emily Cuyler Hammond, in HUMAN EVENTS for June 9, 1958.)

S. WALTER STAUFFER, Member of Congress, 19th District, Penna.: "I find HUMAN EVENTS very helpful in appraising the various events and happenings in Washington, and also in keeping me informed on what is sometimes called, 'the news behind the scenes.' I look forward to reading your letter each week."

Additional copies of 4-page News Section or Article Section: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1000 copies $30. In lots of 5000 $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.

Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, and 1957 volumes available.

For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
M. STANTON EVANS, *Managing Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second-class matter, Washington, D. C. Copyright 1958.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XV, No. 40 HUMAN EVENTS October 6, 1958

Article Section I

YOUR PINK SLIP IS SHOWING, MR. BROWN

The Truth About Knowland's Opponent

By OLIVER CARLSON

LOS ANGELES—Edmund G. "Pat" Brown, who aspires to be California's next Governor, is fervently hoping that the moderate and conservative Democrats of this state have bought a myth. The myth is that Pat Brown, like them, is a moderate, slightly right-of-center Democrat. He looks like one. And before the numerous business and professional groups which he carefully cultivates, his speeches make him sound like one.

Why is Brown's "moderation" a myth? Let's look at the record. And while we look, let's bear in mind that with the rapidly worsening situation in the Far East, California is the most vital and sensitive state in all the West. Mao and Khrushchev are aware of the great concentration of aircraft, missile, electronic and chemical plants here, of our oil fields and refineries, of our great ports and airfields. They know, too—even if Pat Brown is unaware of it—that Communist party membership and concentration in California is the second highest in the Nation. They know that Harry Bridges and Lou Goldblatt continue to boss the International Longshoreman's and Warehouseman's Union, and hence control Pacific Coast shipping. They know there are powerful forces within the Democratic party of California who want to abandon Formosa and Chiang Kai-shek's government to the mercy of the Reds; withdraw the Seventh Fleet; recognize Red China; admit her to the United Nations; and in general appease the USSR no matter what the cost to us or to the rest of the free world.

Indicative of the advances made by these forces within the Democratic ranks is the proposal put forward, in this year's state Democratic platform, that California repeal the "loyalty oaths still required of all public employees, of candidates for public office, and for the use of public school property." A further sign of where California Democrats are going is the fact that the Young Democrats, in drafting their platform, came out for recognition of Red China and called for the immediate abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

One clear voice has stood out above all others warning of the danger of appeasing world communism—that of Senator William F. Knowland.

But what of Pat Brown? For eight years now he has been the chief legal officer of the State of California. Prior to that he was District Attorney for San Francisco. For the past four years he has been commonly recognized as the undisputed leader of the state's Democratic party. The following is his record on communism and Communists.

One of the most successful Communist-front organizations established in the middle 1930's was the National Lawyers Guild. The San Francisco chapter was both large and vocal. Pat Brown, sensing its importance to a young man eager for acclaim and public office, joined up and remained a good-standing member until the beginning of World War II. Of course, the unwarranted attacks of the mighty USSR against little Finland in the late fall of 1939, followed by the Hitler-Stalin Pact of June 1940, made communism and its numerous front organizations anathema to the American people. It was a very appropriate time to get out. And Brown did.

THREE YEARS LATER we were in the war, an ally of Soviet Russia. The Communists and their fellow travelers, who shortly before had denounced President Roosevelt as a warmonger, did a quick about-face when the Nazis invaded Russia. Many front organizations—including the National Lawyers Guild—blossomed forth stronger than ever. Under the circumstances, an eager-beaver lawyer with political aspirations would join up. This is exactly what Pat Brown did. In fact, he became so active that he was elected its vice president.

By 1946 Stalin had lowered the Iron Curtain over Eastern Europe. The Cold War was on. Communist spies and secret agents were uncovered all over the world, including the United States. The order went out from Moscow that Communists everywhere must openly declare their loyalty to the Soviet Union. American public opinion once more became alarmed at Communist infiltration in schools, motion pictures, labor unions and professional organizations. From New York to Los Angeles the duped, the timid and the opportunists joined in a mass exodus from Communist-dominated organizations. So, apparently, did Brown, who claimed to have just discovered that the National Lawyers Guild was dominated by the Reds. And, if Brown denounced the Communists at that time it must have been *sotto voce*, for he continued to get favorable mention in the Communist *People's World* all through 1946.

In February, 1945, District Attorney Brown of San Francisco actively supported a move to grant United States citizenship to Harry Bridges. He denounced moves by the US Immigration Department to have Bridges deported to his native Australia as "a threat to industrial peace." Thanks to the good work of Pat Brown and his friends, Harry Bridges is now an American citizen, and still heads the potent Longshoreman's Union.

When, in 1946, Brown ran for the first time as Democratic candidate for Attorney General, he was formally endorsed by the following organizations,

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all of which were Communist-infiltrated or dominated at that time: Hollywood Independent Citizens' Committee of Arts, Sciences and Professions; National Citizens' Political Action Committee; CIO Council of California; United Committee for Political Action; Conference of Studio Unions.

Always ready to make a speech, he addressed many an organization of dubious origin. According to the *People's World* for June 17, 1946, he was one of the speakers at a big Los Angeles rally under the auspices of a commie front, the "Mobilization for Democracy." The *People's World* of November 7, 1945 also listed Brown as a committee member for the banquet honoring the "American Youth for Democracy," a well-known Communist front.

The heart and center of Communist indoctrination for all of Northern California was the "California Labor School" at San Francisco. Here were trained the young professional revolutionists for their work in mass organizations. Here artists, writers and entertainers were taught how to turn their talents to the use of communism. The documentation which now exists upon that school would fill volumes. *But when, in November, 1946, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Un-American Activities in California called upon District Attorney Brown of San Francisco to assist in an investigation of the California Labor School, Brown refused.*

IN 1950 PAT BROWN was the only Democrat to be elected to a major state office. He became Attorney General. He was the legal arm of the state.

During the past eight years, state and congressional investigation committees have conducted innumerable probes on subversives and subversive movements in this state. Certainly it was the duty of the Attorney General and his staff to assist in this work. But while Brown found it expedient, from time to time, to sound off against the dangers of communism in general, he was strangely reluctant to do anything about it in California. His office supposedly has a special division devoted to checking on subversive activities here, but I have searched in vain to find out what it has done in the past eight years. It appears to be completely dormant.

Such vagaries, it should be noted, are not "ancient history"—events confined to the past of a decade or so ago. The most amazing development out of Pat Brown's office took place just this year—in April, 1958—when the Attorney General sent out to the leading Peace Officers of California, (Sheriffs, Police Chiefs, *etc.*) an official booklet prepared and printed by the Justice Department of California, Division of Criminal Law and Enforcement, entitled: "Guide to Community Relations for Peace Officers."

In this official document, prepared under the direct guidance of Assistant Attorney General Emmet Daly, and with the official blessing of the Attorney General himself, is a bibliography of selected books, pamphlets, and audio-visual aids designed to give the Peace Officers of California a thorough understanding of the many aspects of minority groups. The idea is a splendid one—except for one thing: That bibliography is a loaded list—loaded with books and pamphlets by authors well known for their Communist or pro-Communist affiliations.

Here for police officers to study at the recommendation of the Attorney General are works by:

GENE WELTFISH. Social anthropologist. She is probably best remembered for her public speeches during the Korean War when she insisted that our troops had used germ warfare, as charged by the Chinese Communists. She took an active part on a host of Communist-front organizations. She was one of the signers of the statement in defense of Gerhart Eisler, notorious agent of the Communist International in the United States. One of her pamphlets, *The Races of Mankind*, which the Attorney General recommends, was barred from use by the War Department because its declared aim was to create racial antagonism.

FRANZ BOAS AND RUTH BENEDICT (both deceased). Social anthropologists. Boas' record as an active supporter of Communist causes goes back at least to 1931. Ruth Benedict was a close co-worker with Gene Weltfish. All their writings which are recommended are given a pro-Communist slant.

MAXWELL S. STEWART. Author and editor. Identified as sponsor or active participant in at least 36 Communist-front organizations. At one time editor of "Soviet Russia Today."

DR. E. FRANKLIN FRAZIER. Negro sociologist. The files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities contain 18 citations of Frazier's connections with Communist causes in the United States. His book was highly praised in the Communist press and literary journals when it first appeared in 1949.

CAREY MCWILLIAMS. Editor and writer. Three of his books are included in the recommended bibliography. McWilliams is at present editor of *The Nation*. In 1929 he was one of the attorneys for "Amtorg," the official Soviet trading organization in the United States. He was also a leading member of the National Lawyers' Guild at the same time Pat Brown belonged to it. All three of his books on Brown's recommended list have been highly praised by the Communist press.

Space does not permit me to cite the many other well known pro-Communists whose books or pamphlets are likewise recommended reading for California peace officers. Had this reading list been loaded—for example—with racist literature, you can be sure there would have been a hue and cry from Oregon to the Mexican border.

How did it happen that Brown and his staff issued such a slanted list of readings? Was it intentional? Was it due to carelessness? Or was it stupidity? Whatever the reason—and I hope Brown gives us the answer—the responsibility is his.

If, in the face of the record I have cited above, moderate California Democrats think Pat Brown is the kind of a man they want for Governor, Heaven help them—and us! Of course he's no Communist; he's just an opportunist whose pink slip is showing.

Oliver Carlson is a well-known writer on political subjects. The author of many books, he has contributed frequently to such magazines as *The Freeman* and *Reader's Digest*.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "YOUR PINK SLIP IS SHOWING, MR. BROWN" at $_____.

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ *5 weeks for $1* ☐ *1 year for $11*

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XV, No. 40 HUMAN EVENTS October 6, 1958

Article Section II

THE ISSUE IS *NOT* QUEMOY

By WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN

"WHY DIE for Quemoy?" has become the theme song of an assorted group of defeatists, appeasers, anti-anti-Communists, pacifists and politicians who hope to make political capital out of a national crisis in foreign policy. At first hearing the slogan sounds plausible. Why should American lives be risked for a rocky islet off the South China coast?

But the issue is not Quemoy. It is not even the larger island of Formosa, or Taiwan. It is a question of supreme moral and political significance—whether the great Communist empires of the Soviet Union and China, working together on a squeeze play basis, can take what they want by force and violence and intimidate the United States into running away from or evading its voluntarily assumed treaty obligations to an ally.

The emptiness of the appeasers' question becomes even clearer if one remembers the day in April, 1861, when Confederate guns fired on Fort Sumter. If anyone in the North at that time asked, "Why fight for Fort Sumter?— it's indefensible anyway," his voice has been lost to history. For there was general realization, North and South, that the firing on Sumter was not the *cause*, but the *occasion* of what William Seward, Lincoln's Secretary of State, called the irrepressible conflict. What was at stake was not the immediate possession of a little island off the coast of South Carolina, but the big questions of secession and slavery.

Just 20 years ago the British and French Governments, undoubtedly representing the feelings of the majority of their peoples, decided that it was better to let Hitler annex the predominantly German-speaking Sudetenland areas of Czechoslovakia than to risk war by refusing his demand. Neville Chamberlain thought he had brought back from Munich "Peace in our time."

A French publicist, later an active figure in the Vichy regime, Marcel Déat, expressed the Munich mood in a phrase that acquired considerable circulation in France before the outbreak of the war: "Why die for Danzig?"

Now every rational human being would agree that war, especially in this age of weapons of mass destruction, is a very terrible evil. If it were possible to designate any single sacrifice, short of honor and liberty, that would guarantee permanent peace, that sacrifice would probably be worth making. But the joker in appeasement, in giving the aggressor what he wants for the sake of peace, is the joker involved in submitting to blackmail. The blackmailer always comes back for more. So does the aggressor.

Hitler was not interested in the Germans of Austria, the Sudetenland or Danzig, except as cannon fodder for new seizures of territory, new conquests of non-German peoples. The Chinese Communist leaders and Soviet dictator Khrushchev—the latter in a communication so insulting and truculent, so full of "inadmissible threats" that long-suffering President Eisenhower ordered its summary rejection—have made it brutally clear, to all but the incurably blind, deaf and dumb, that they will not be satisfied with the cession of the Quemoy and Matsu island groups.

These are mere steppingstones to the conquest of Taiwan. Should we tear up our treaty with the Chinese Nationalist Government, as Khrushchev insolently demanded, how long would it be before we were faced with another Peiping-Moscow squeeze play, aimed at Japan, the Philippines, Korea, Vietnam? Appeasement is merely surrender on the installment plan. It is a one-direction downward slide in national power and prestige.

THOSE AMERICANS who have accepted with little thought the arguments of the "Why Die for Quemoy" chorus, with Dean Acheson, ex-Senator Herbert Lehman and Walter Lippmann as cheerleaders, should seriously consider the evidence for the following propositions:

- *First, the occasion of a conflict is seldom the basic cause of the conflict, and it is deceptive and misleading to identify the two.*
- *Second, a territorial concession that might be admissible in free, give-and-take negotiation may be as disastrous as a lost battle or campaign if it is extorted by force or threat of force.*
- *Third, war has rarely, if ever, been averted by one-sided retreat.*

Both the Truman and the Eisenhower Administrations have clearly renounced the idea of using force to upset the status quo in Communist-ruled countries, even when the appeal to our hearts and consciences was agonizing, as in the case of the heroic Hungarian uprising. If to this doctrine of nonintervention in countries behind the iron curtain, we add the doctrine of running away when the Communists begin to show their teeth in some new project of aggression, it is easy to foresee a time when the world balance of power will have shifted decisively in favor of the totalitarians.

Winston Churchill wrote in his war memoirs: "If you will not fight for the right when you can

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

easily win without bloodshed; if you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly; you may come to a moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance of survival. There may even be a worse case. You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory, because it is better to perish than to live as slaves."

It is argued by the appeasement-minded that Quemoy and Matsu are indefensible, that they are of no value to the defense of Formosa, that they "belong" geographically to mainland China and that their defense can be dissociated from that of Formosa. Every one of these contentions is false and fallacious.

Quemoy has already held out for more than a month without any direct American aid. Gibraltar, which has a somewhat similar position off the mainland coast of Spain, once successfully withstood a siege of four years. Quemoy and Matsu in Nationalist hands are valuable lookout points and advance bases for the protection of Formosa; while they are in this status it would be most difficult for the Chinese Reds to fit out invasion flotillas in the ports nearest Formosa, Amoy and Foochow. The whole picture would, of course, change very much for the worse if they were taken by storm or given up.

As for the idea, which seems to be especially popular in Great Britain, that Red China has some kind of moral or legal claim to the offshore islands, this is not compatible with the nature of civil war. In such a situation the occupation title of one side is as good as that of the other. It can certainly be assumed that the handing over of any territory to the Chinese Reds would be against the will of the Chinese civilian population affected. Three quarters of the Chinese prisoners taken in Korea, holding out against months of badgering, cajolery, threats to their families by spokesmen for the Communist regime, preferred to go to Formosa, rather than return to their native country. When the Tachen Islands were evacuated in 1955 almost the whole native population opted for resettlement in Formosa. The precise vote was 18,505 for leaving, 19 for staying.

No matter how much sophistry may be expended to prove the contrary, the fate of Formosa will almost certainly be determined by the fate of Quemoy and Matsu. The consequences for Chinese Nationalist morale of having a large part of their armed forces destroyed, or even forced to withdraw from outposts of high strategic and moral value, would be catastrophic. It would create in Formosa an atmosphere of helpless pessimism in which a coup on the model of what happened in Iraq in July might take place, thereby depriving the United States of an unsinkable aircraft carrier and giving the Communist axis an excellent airplane and submarine base on the lines of communication between Japan and the Philippines.

Critics of the firm policy which the Administration has announced, but not yet implemented, lament that Quemoy and Matsu are an "unfavorable" battleground and point with alarm to the absence of allies and of wholehearted UN support. But is it not naive, almost to the point of absurdity, to imagine skilled and ruthless Communist experts in conquest and subversion chivalrously giving us an advantageous battlefield?

Surely the time and place to resist Communist aggression is whenever and wherever it takes place. If we start abandoning every allegedly "weak spot," every "unfavorable battlefield," we will soon have no spots or battlefields, favorable or unfavorable, left. If one replays the Korean drama, wouldn't the ending, in all probability, have been infinitely happier and more satisfactory to American prestige if America had gone it alone, under the military leadership of General MacArthur, who believed there was no substitute for victory? The UN was no help at all in the Korean war, just a whimpering nuisance. And the value of the minuscule forces which a few of our European allies put on the front was more than cancelled, in some cases, by the timid backseat driving of their governments.

The greatest danger to our firm stance in the Strait of Formosa is the apparent disposition of Secretary Dulles, after all his brave and steadfast words, to bring the issue before the United Nations. This seems a very unpromising move, because, if the UN could agree on a solution, this would almost certainly fall far short of the requirements of our treaty with Nationalist China. We very properly did not consult the UN when we concluded this treaty. And no UN alchemy could erase the moral and political consequences of welshing on or evading an obligation which was proposed by the President and ratified by overwhelming majorities in Congress.

The Verdun of the free world has been at different places in different times, depending on where the Communists were driving for conquest. Ten years ago it was in West Berlin. Eight years ago it was on the beachheads of Korea. Two years ago it was in the streets of Budapest. Accident, not our own choice, has today given Quemoy this significance of a Verdun, which should not, must not be allowed to fall while our Seventh Fleet, with ample means of breaking the blockade, stands by inactive.

William Henry Chamberlin is a prominent journalist and the author of many books, including *America's Second Crusade* (Regnery). His most recent contribution to HUMAN EVENTS was "The Power to Destroy," September 8, 1958.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "THE ISSUE IS NOT QUEMOY" at $_____.

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED